

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

URGENT

CHOATE HALL & STEWART LLP

JAN 0 9 2006

_		
_	_	-
_	-	v
	_	•

PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL

Recipient		Company		Fax	Phone	
Board of P	atent Appeals	U.S. Patent ar Office	nd Trademark	571-273-00	53	
Commissioner for Patents		U.S. Patent as Office	U.S. Patent and Trademark 571-273-8300 Office			
From	Brenda Herschba	ach Jarrell, Ph.D.	Number of Pa	ages 3		_
Date	January 9, 2006		Client Numbe	er 2002	834-0058	
Dhono	(617) 248-5175		Operator		Time Sent	_

Phone

Comments

Applicant: Serial No.:

(617) 248-5175

Bannon, et al. 09/478,668

Examiner: Art Unit:

Huynh, P. 1644

Filed: Title:

January 6, 2000

Methods and Reagents for Decreasing Clinical Reactions to Allergy

Please find attached the following document for the above-referenced case:

Request to Cancel Oral Hearing (2 pages).

URGENT

Return by

Inter-office Mail

Hold for pick-up

CHOATE HALL & STEWART 6172484000 JAN. 9. 2006 9:15AM_



ATTORNEY DOCKET NUMBER: 2002834-0058 (CIP4 DIV1)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:

Bannon, et al.

Serial No.:

09/478,668

Filed: For:

January 6, 2000

METHODS AND REAGENTS FOR DECREASING CLINICAL REACTIONS TO ALLERGY

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

CERTIFICATE OF FACSPALLE TRANSMISSION

Huynh, P.

1644

PURSUAN: 102 2096 OG 30-31 I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the Commissioner For Patents,

P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313

Examiner:

Art Unit:

REQUEST TO CANCEL ORAL HEARING

An Oral Hearing is currently scheduled in the above-referenced case for tomorrow, January 10, 2005. The case includes rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and rejections over art, one of the art-based rejections being based on denial of a priority claim (the cited reference represents the inventors' own work). As noted in the Appeal Brief, this case is one of a family of cases, each of which contains virtually identical rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Some of the cases also contain a similar art rejection over the inventors' own work.

Two days ago (specifically, on Saturday, January 7, 2006), the undersigned received a Decision on Appeal in one of the related cases (specifically, in 09/455,294; the "Decision"). This Decision did not address the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112. However, it affirmed the priority claim denial, and therefore the art rejections. The Decision acknowledged, however, that an alternative, and proper ground for overcoming a prior art reference representing work of the inventors is through submission of a Declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131.

Given the issuance of the Decision, Appellant has recognized that an Oral Hearing would not be productive at this time. Prosecution could more productively be advanced by filing a Continuation application to first remove the relevant prior art rejections (through the filing of a Declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131), thereby reducing the issues on appeal. The undersigned apologizes for the late notice of this cancellation, necessitated by the unfortunate timing of the Decision.

e man e e e

Respectfully submitted,

Brenda Hersenbach Jarrell, Ph.D. Registration Number 39,223

PATENT DEPARTMENT CHOATE, HALL & STEWART 2 International Place Boston, MA 02110 Telephone: (617) 248-5000 Facsimile: (617) 248-4000